

Application No.: 10/025,765  
Amendment dated November 18, 2003  
Reply to Office Action dated August 26, 2003

Docket No.: 8733.514.00-US

### REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the present application. The final Office Action dated August 26, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 24 and 26. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 14-26 and 28-29 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based upon the above amendments and the following remarks are requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 14-20, 23-26 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,327,011, issued to Kim in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,509,076, issued to Otaki et al. ("Otaki"). Applicant traverses the rejection below.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), subject matter developed by another person which qualifies as prior art only under one or more subsections of (e), (f), and (g) of § 102, shall not preclude patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 103 where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. Applicant respectfully submits the present application (application serial number 10/025,765) and Kim were, at the time of the invention of the present application, made and owned by LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. Therefore, Kim is not valid prior art against the claims of the present application. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The Office Action alleges that "it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the LCD device comprising as disclosed with the organic film made of photo-acrylate for laminating with pressure-sensitive adhesive layer" (Office Action, page 4). Applicant respectfully submits Otaki fails to teach or suggest all of the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Otaki fails to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display (LCD) device or method for manufacturing a LCD device that include, among other features, "wherein the passivation layers include BenzoCycloButene (BCB)" as recited in independent claims 1, 5, 9 and 24 of the present application.

Application No.: 10/025,765  
Amendment dated November 18, 2003  
Reply to Office Action dated August 26, 2003

Docket No.: 8733.514.00-US

Otaki merely discloses "a pressure-sensitive adhesive for a pressure-sensitive adhesive layer in a volume hologram laminate comprising a substrate and, stacked on the substrate in the following order, a first pressure-sensitive adhesive layer, a volume hologram layer, a second pressure-sensitive adhesive layer, and a surface protective film, said second pressure-sensitive adhesive layer having been formed from an acrylic pressure-sensitive adhesive comprising an acrylic copolymer resin, composed mainly of an alkyl acrylate, and a crosslinking agent" (col. 1, lines 50-59). However, Otaki fails to teach or suggest "the passivation layers include BenzoCycloButene (BCB)" as recited in claims 1, 5, 9 and 24. As such, Otaki fails to provide a LCD device and method for manufacturing a LCD device that would provide all the recited features in claims 1, 5, 9 and 24. Accordingly, claim 1 and its rejected dependent claims 2-3, claim 5 and its rejected dependent claims 6-7, claim 9 and its rejected dependent claims 10-11, 14-20, and 23, and claim 24 and its rejected dependent claims 25-26 and 28-29 are patentable over Otaki. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

In the Office Action claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim and Otaki and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,150,430, issued to Walters et al. ("Walters"). The Office Action rejected claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim and Otaki, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0079289, by Doh. As discussed above, Kim is not valid prior art against the claims of the present application. Applicant traverses the rejections because no combination of Otaki, Walters and Doh teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Otaki, Walters and Doh fail to teach or suggest a method for manufacturing a LCD device "wherein the passivation layers include BenzoCycloButene (BCB)" as recited in independent claim 9, from which rejected claims 12, 21 and 22 depend.

Walters merely discloses "a process of producing an adherent layer on organic polymeric substrates using a composition consisting essentially of organofunctional silane, a radiation activated acid catalyst and an organic solvent" (col. 1, lines 8-12).

Doh discloses "an etching apparatus of a glass substrate capable of shortening the etch time by heating an etchant for etching the glass substrate to a certain temperature and supplying the heated etchant to an etching bath" (page. 2, paragraph [0028]).

Application No.: 10/025,765  
Amendment dated November 18, 2003  
Reply to Office Action dated August 26, 2003

Docket No.: 8733.514.00-US

However, Walters and Doh fail to teach or suggest a method of manufacturing a LCD device "wherein the passivation layers include BenzoCycloButene (BCB)" as recited in claim 9 of the present application. Accordingly, Walters and Doh fail to remedy the deficient teachings of Otaki such that a combination of Otaki and Walters or Doh would provide a method of manufacturing a LCD device having the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. By virtue of their dependence from claim 9, rejected claims 12, 21 and 22 also includes the features recited in claim 9; thus, claims 12, 21 and 22 are patentable over any combination of Otaki, Walters and Doh. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested.

If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: November 18, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Valerie Hayes  
Registration No.: 53,005  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorney for Applicant